

Appl. No. 10768,364
Atty. Docket No. 8590D
Amdt. dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 9 - 16 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 9, 11 and 13-16 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harlow (US Patent No. 4,000,348) in view of Hairabedian (US Patent No. 3,459,609). This rejection is traversed. According to the Office Action, Harlow discloses a method of creating an electrical cable wherein the method includes providing first and second webs (T, T) of dielectric materials, providing conductive wires (C), and laminating or bonding the webs and wires in a face-to-face layered relationship. (referring generally to Figure 1 and its description) The Office Action admits that Harlow does not disclose stretching the bonded laminate in order to form a plurality of spaced, parallel flat conductors. However, according to the Office Action, Hairabedian is also drawn to a cable fabrication method and allegedly teaches that stretching is used to achieve the final wire spacing. (See Col. 6, lines 42-52; Col. 7, lines 6-14.) Therefore, according to the Office Action, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the resulting laminate in Harlow motivated by the fact that Hairabedian teaches to stretch the resulting laminate to adjust the spacing of the wires in the laminate and an artisan would appreciate that the same could be done in Harlow.

Neither Harlow nor Hairabedian teaches or suggests providing a 'sheet' of conductive material bonded in a face-to-face layered relationship with first and second web materials forming a laminate and incrementally stretching the laminate to form a plurality of spaced, parallel flat conductors. Instead, each of the references teaches using a plurality of conductors in the form of wires or filaments laminated with dielectric webs. As indicated in the Office Action, Harlow at Col. 10, lines 25-29, discloses that flexible copper circuits may be fed in place of Conductors; however, it does not disclose incrementally stretching the laminate to form a plurality of spaced, parallel flat conductors as claimed. Therefore, the combination of Harlow and Hairabedian does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Claims 9, 11 and 13-16 and the subject claims are patentable over Harlow in view of Hairabedian.

The Office Action also rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harlow in view of Hairabedian as applied to claim 9 above, and further

Page 4 of 6

Appl. No. 10/768,364
Atty. Docket No. 8590D
Amdt. dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005
Customer No. 27752

in view of Ostman et al. (US Patent No. 4,085,502). According to the Office Action, Harlow in view of Hairabedian discloses feeding conductor wires and Ostman discloses feeding a conductive metal sheet (50) which is cut or slit to form individual conductors before being laminated. (Col. 5, lines 34-53.) First, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine Ostman with the foregoing references. Ostman teaches a process for manufacturing jumper cables which is no way related to processes disclosed in Harlow or Hairabedian. Second, the combination does not teach or suggest providing a 'sheet' of conductive material bonded in a face-to-face layered relationship with first and second web materials to form a laminate and subsequently incrementally stretching the laminate to form a plurality of spaced, parallel flat conductors. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over Harlow in view of Hairabedian and further in view of Ostman.

Further, the Office Action has rejected Claims 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abuto et al. (US Patent No. 5,804,021) in view of Ness (US Patent No. 4,525,407). According to the Office Action, Abuto discloses a method of making a nonwoven laminate by providing a first and second web (14, 16) of dielectric materials and a third sheet (12) which is elastomeric and includes conductive material. (Col. 6, lines 14-47) The sheets are bonded in a layered relationship as shown in Figure 8, but Abuto does not disclose stretching the laminate as required by the claims. According to the Office Action, Ness teaches that stretching causes the material to be more extensible and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stretch the laminate in Abuto, thereby causing the laminate to be more extensible, as taught by Ness, motivated by the fact that the resulting laminate would be more extensible. Regardless why one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the subject references, the combination of Abuto and Ness does not teach or suggest providing a 'sheet' of conductive material bonded in a face-to-face layered relationship with first and second web materials to form a laminate and incrementally stretching the laminate to form a plurality of spaced, parallel flat conductors. Consequently, claims 9 and 12 are patentable over Abuto in view of Ness.

Appl. No. 10/768,364
Atty. Docket No. 8590D
Amdt. dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005
Customer No. 27752


Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application and allowance of Claims 9-16 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By _____
Signature
Jay A. Krebs
Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 41,914
(513) 634-9959

Date: March 9, 2006
Customer No. 27752